

in a saying here is what we think are the reasonable cuts if we are going to achieve a balanced budget.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S 1995 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET AND RESCISSIONS OF AUTHORITY REQUEST ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 104-74)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's 1995 Supplemental Budget and Rescissions of Authority Request Act of 1995. This transmittal does not represent an endorsement of the contents of the District's budget.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 12, 1995.

□ 1330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS A CUT IN MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak about the Republican budget and its effect on Medicare and Social Security. The assertion is trying to be made on the Republican side that this is not a cut. Well, I beg to differ. To the senior citizens of this country who have paid all their lives into this trust fund, it is a cut.

A cut is a reduction in services, an increase in premiums, an increase in copays and deductibles. So to the senior citizen out there, or to their family, you can call it anything you want to call it; it is a reduction in services. It is less than they expected to be able to get out of this very, very important program in their lives, and let us remember who we are affecting here. We are not just affecting the recipient of the program for the person that is enrolled in Medicare. We are affecting their entire family. The 30-, and 40-, and 50-year-old sons and daughters of these recipients of Social Security will have to make up the money if their parent cannot come up with it for the

copay, or the deductible or the increased premium, and remember that this increased premium will come out of their Social Security check. It is automatically deducted, so it is in effect a decrease in their Social Security monthly payment.

Mr. Speaker, we have got lots and lots of senior citizens around the country who live on their Social Security. It is the only thing they have to look forward to every month to pay their rent, to pay their heating bill, to pay for their food, and so that amount will be reduced. Let us also remember this budget calls for a reduction in the Social Security benefit. It calls for an arbitrary reduction in the cost of living escalator by over a half a percent a year beginning in 1999.

By the year 2002 it means a \$240 cut in their Social Security benefit. So, because of the Medicare cut which comes to about \$1,000 a person a year immediately, the \$240 cut in their Social Security benefit by the year 2002, these folks who are living on Social Security and their families who help support them are going to be out about \$1,240 a year that they now count on in order to get by.

Now let us remember that these programs are supported by taxes. There is no deficit in the Medicare trust fund. There is no deficit in the Social Security trust fund. There is more money coming into those trust funds today than is spent, and we believe that it is wrong to make up for problems somewhere else in the budget out of those trust funds, yet that is precisely what the Republican budget does.

They said proudly for days, "We're not going to touch Social Security; it's off the table." Well, it is on the table again in a big way, \$1,240 per person per year it is on the table, and that is not what was said. What was said before the budget came out was Social Security is off the table, it is not going to be cut.

And now we even see why it is being cut. It is being cut for a tax break. The Medicare cut almost equals the amount that is going out to give a tax break, a tax windfall, for the wealthiest people in the country.

So now we see the real value that is being expressed. A budget is an expression of values in its most important meaning. The value that the Republican Party is expressing in this budget is that it is fine to take dollars, \$1,240 a year ultimately, from the middle-income families of this country and transfer it to people making \$200, and \$300, and \$400 and \$500,000 a year so they can get a \$20,000-a-year tax break. We are going to take \$1,240 a year from middle-income families and families trying to stay in the middle class.

Is that our sense of values? Is that what we want to have happen in this country? I do not think so. I think what we want is to help middle-income families stay in the middle class, and that is what Social Security and Medicare have primarily been about.

This is not the right approach, this is not what we ought to be doing, and if you say the Social Security funds may not be stable and solvent 5 and 10 years from now, I say, "Fine, let's look at that. Let's look at the whole health care system as we do it, and let's not start this discussion by giving a \$20,000-a-year tax break to families earning \$250,000 a year. Let's put that off to the side. Let's save that one for later when we finally got enough money in the budget to consider things like that. But for right now let's talk about the real problems of our country: education, Medicare, Social Security, keeping those programs there for the middle-income people who paid their taxes their entire life. Let's not take it from them. Let's help strengthen those programs."

So I hope, as we go into this most important budget, this Republican budget represents the greatest change in U.S. budgets in many, many years. Let us have a full debate in this Congress about what is actually happening here. This budget will have direct significance, dramatic consequences, in the lives of average working American families. They deserve to know what this budget will do to them, and before we vote on it and cast votes for it or against it, let us let the people know what is in it. Let us let them participate in the debate. Then we can make a judgment. And I believe if that is done, we will make the right judgment, and the right judgment is not to invade Medicare and Social Security to give tax breaks to the people who have done the best in our country. That will not be our judgment, and I urge that, after this debate, we will make a better judgment, and we will make sure that Social Security and Medicare are not invaded, and that these cuts are not made to the middle-income people of this country simply to give a tax break to the people who have it made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GRAHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

OSHA UNDER ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, OSHA, the agency responsible for the health and safety of workers in this Nation, is presently under intense attack. Particularly my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], who is a fellow member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, has launched a relentless series of attacks on OSHA.

Today, I would like to make a special appeal to Congressman NORWOOD that we lower our voices and make a sincere effort to humanize our discussion. Instead of focusing on the overwhelming but abstract statistics such as the 56,000 hard-working Americans who die each year from job related causes, from now on let us emphasize instead the individual workers with names and faces.

There are workers in Mr. NORWOOD's district like William McDaniel, who without adequate restraining protection fell 80 feet off a television tower to his death in Pendergrass, GA. Like Paul Powell, who was crushed in the unguarded drive shaft of a machine at an Augusta, GA, plant. Like Earnest Gosnell of Homer, GA, who was operating a timber log skidder that had no safety belts when the machine overturned and crushed him. These fine Americans were all residents of Mr. NORWOOD's district in Georgia.

What's really alarming here is that Mr. NORWOOD and so many other Republicans show no concern whatsoever for these workers and the other 56,000 hard-working Americans who die each year from work-related causes. It is really disappointing and tragic that so many Members of Congress like Mr. NORWOOD, would rather launch a cold-hearted and sweeping attack on a Federal agency than do everything possible to protect their own constituents.

It is the duty of every Member of Congress to recognize and remember that OSHA protects the lives of workers in every district.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about the Vietnam War Memorial is that the Vietnam War Memorial names names of each individual soldier who gave his life for his country. I do not think we should ever again have monuments for unknown soldiers. Why have celebrations of unknown soldiers when you could name the names and have the faces? It will make it less likely than for those who make decisions about war in the future to be careless or casual when they are making those decisions.

In the same way we ought to try and humanize all the work we do here in Congress. In the budget that has been prepared by the Republicans, OSHA has been drastically reduced. OSHA next week will be under attack in the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. An omnibus bill which will deal with work-related protections will be on the floor of the committee, and OSHA will again be under attack.

OSHA saves lives. Stop and consider that OSHA saves lives. Fifty-six thousand people every year die of accidents on the job or work-related causes, diseases they contract on the job or accidents they have and later die in the hospital away from the job. Six thousand die immediately in accidents on the job, but 56,000 people a year is as many people as died, almost as many people that died, in the Vietnam war over the whole 7-year period of the Vietnam war.

□ 1345

It is a very serious matter. Accidents in the workplace, conditions in the workplace, are very serious. Let us not condemn our workers to unsafe conditions unnecessarily. OSHA protects lives.

Medicaid protects lives too. In the same budget that is going to reduce OSHA, we have tremendous reductions for Medicaid. I am not talking about Medicare, because we can talk about Medicare and the reductions there. That also needs to be debated. But Medicare will be protected. It will be discussed at length on this floor.

Greater cuts have been made in Medicaid than have been made in Medicare, and the Republican budget proposes to get rid of Medicaid as an entitlement. Medicaid is health care for poor people. We are going to have a second-class health care system sanctioned by the Federal Government. One system for those not in Medicaid, those who are in Medicare and can afford Medicare and can afford private insurance, and another system for the poor, that is financed by the Government, a second-class system that will be left to the States to run it. And there will be no Federal entitlements. When the States run out of money, if you are sick or ill, you will not get any help.

Those are human beings out there with faces. Those are people that we all know. Somebody will know the workers who are killed in accidents or the workers who die from job related causes. Somebody knows somebody who is going to die as a result of those cuts in Medicaid and Medicare. Let us not proceed with an across-the-board cut in Medicaid of 18 percent, higher than the cut in Medicare, across-the-board cut, and assume that human beings are not going to die as a result.

Second-class health care is dangerous health care. I once had a situation where a hospital about to go broke in my district told me that we are down to such a level that we cannot afford to really sterilize our towels properly. We do not have the equipment.

I said to the administrator of that hospital, if you cannot sterilize your towels properly, it is time to close the hospital. Let us not try to keep it open.

The provision of second-class health care is dangerous and deadly. If we treat people as numbers and do not treat them as human beings, we run the risk of destroying lives. Let us lower our voices and look at the faces again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. ROUKEMA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MEDICARE: CUT OR LOSE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader probably has a point when he was saying—excuse me, I mean the distinguished minority leader, force of habit—Mr. GEPHARDT, was giving a speech a few minutes ago saying that Medicare is going to be cut. And I think to some degree that you can argue that there is going to be certainly a modification of Medicare, and you may want to say that that is a cut. But I would say, what is better, modifying Medicare or losing Medicare? It will be broke under the current Medicare system in 6 years. It is not a matter of let us keep business as usual and avoid changing Medicare. We have got to do that.

You know, I wish that the critics, and most of the critics right now are coming from the minority side of the aisle, would enter into the solution as freely as they have entered into the criticism of the Republican plan. If they could enter the debate with facts and substance, instead of just with tactics and strategy, it would be so helpful. We need the help of the leadership and the wisdom of the Democrat Party.

We on the Republican side would be shortchanging ourselves if we said we had all the answers. And that is why our Founding Fathers had a two party system. We need the ideas from both sides of the aisle in order to come up with the solution.

The fact is, though, that the Clinton cabinet is the one who said Medicare is going to go broke in 6 years. The Clinton cabinet also has come out with statistics showing that baby boomers are going to be retiring in the year 2002, the Social Security trust fund runs out of money in the year 2030, and these are huge problems.

I yield to my friend from Michigan, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. You know, what is so very interesting is that it was 2 years ago that the trustees of the Medicare trust fund came to Congress and said, "This trust fund is going broke, and it will be out of money by the year 2000." This time they came back and said it might last until 2002.

But the fact is, it is a political hot potato. For the last 2 years, with the existing majority in Congress and the President, they did not want to deal with it because they knew it left a target. They were politically vulnerable.

Republicans met and said, do we want to save Medicare? If we do, are we